

Inventor: Jose Miguel Cabezas
Serial No.: 10/753,672
Army Dkt. No. 018579.0082US1

Art Unit: 3679
Examiner: David Bochna

Remarks/Arguments

Claim Objections

Claims 7 was objected to for having grammatical errors. In response, claim 7 has been amended to remove the grammatical errors and to elucidate the claim elements.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5 were rejected as being anticipated by Egner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,573,282) (Egner). The applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection for the following reasons.

Egner fails to disclose an internal flange recess comprising a textured surface at least partially surrounding the bore. The examiner apparently considers all surfaces to inherently have some texture to them. Whether every surface is textured depends on the meaning given to the term "textured". Insight into how the term "textured" should be interpreted can be gleaned from the specification and claims.

With regard to the specification, the term "textured surface" is defined to mean "a surface formed with gaps or other features adapted to engage a surface of a plastic flange in order to form a better seal with, and/or to better retain the plastic flange." (page 10, forth full paragraph). Surely, not every surface is adapted to engage a surface to form a better seal. "Better" is a relative word and that infers that some surfaces are textured and some are not. In addition, the figures of the specification clearly show that some surfaces are textured and some are not – at least according to the definition of "textured" in the specification.

With regard to the claims, the term "textured surface" is recited in claim 1. As every element is a limitation, the applicant's meaning of textured surface must be more narrow than one that includes every surface.

Inventor: Jose Miguel Cabezas
Serial No.: 10/753,672
Army Dkt. No. 018579.0082US1

Art Unit: 3679
Examiner: David Bochna

Although the applicant considers it to be unnecessary, claim 1 has been amended to import the definition of "textured surface" into the claim. Claim 1 now expressly recites "a textured surface...adapted to engage another surface". Clearly, Egner does not disclose a surface that is adapted to engage another surface.

Conclusion

Based on the meaning of "textured surface" within the specification, its use in the figures, and its use as a limitation in the claims, Egner cannot be said to disclose an internal flange recess comprising a textured surface. Accordingly, it is submitted that all claims are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Rutan & Tucker, LLP

Dated: January 21, 2005

By: 

Martin Fessenmaier
Reg. No. 46697

Attorneys for Applicant(s)
Post Office Box 1950
Costa Mesa, CA 92628-1950
Tel: (714) 641-5100
Fax: (714) 546-9035